



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/815,858	03/22/2001	Michael A. Brooking	00 P 5273 US	5437

7590 03/16/2004

Elsa Keller
Legal Administrator
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

CUMMING, WILLIAM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2683	7

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/815,858

Applicant(s)

BROOKING, ET AL

Examiner

WILLIAM D CUMMING

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on February 6, 2004. These drawings are approved.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification fails to provide an enabling disclosure for the logic encoded on the computer processable medium since this "*logic encoded*" is not disclosed and is known only to the inventor. In computer applications, it is not unusual for the claimed invention to involve two areas of prior art or more than one technology, e.g., an appropriately programmed computer and an area of application of said computer. *White Consol. Indus.*, 214 USPQ at 821. In regard to the "*skilled in the art*" standard, in cases involving both the art of computer programming, and another technology, the examiner must recognize that the knowledge of persons skilled in both technologies is the appropriate criteria for

determining sufficiency. See *In re Naquin*, 398 F.2d 863, 158 USPQ 317 (CCPA 1968); *In re Brown*, 477 F.2d 946, 177 USPQ 691 (CCPA 1973); and *White Consol. Indus. v. Vega Servo-Control, Inc.*, 214 USPQ 796, 822 (S.D.Mich. 1982), *aff'd on related grounds*, 713 F.2d 788, 218 USPQ 961 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

In a typical computer application, system components are often represented in a "block diagram" format, i.e., a group of hollow rectangles representing the elements of the system, functionally labeled, and interconnected by lines. Such block diagram computer cases may be categorized into (A) systems which include but are more comprehensive than a computer and (B) systems wherein the block elements are totally within the confines of a computer.

The first category of such block diagram cases involves systems which include a computer as well as other system hardware and/or software components. In order to meet his or her burden of establishing a reasonable basis for questioning the adequacy of such disclosure, the examiner should initiate a factual analysis of the system by focusing on each of the individual block element components. More specifically, such an inquiry should focus on the diverse functions attributed to each block element as well as the teachings in the specification as to how such a component could be implemented. Based on such an analysis, the examiner has reasonably contend that more than routine experimentation would be required by one of ordinary skill in the art to implement such a component or components, that component or components is specifically be challenged by the examiner as part of this 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

rejection. Additionally, the examiner has determine whether certain of the hardware or software components depicted as block elements are themselves complex assemblages which have widely differing characteristics and which must be precisely coordinated with other complex assemblages. Under such circumstances, a reasonable basis does exist for challenging such a functional block diagram form of disclosure. See *In re Ghiron*, 442 F.2d 985, 169 USPQ 723 (CCPA 1971) and *In re Brown, supra*. Moreover, even if the applicants has cited prior art patents or publications to demonstrate that particular block diagram hardware or software components are old, it should not always be considered as self-evident how such components are to be interconnected to function in a disclosed complex manner. See *In re Scarbrough*, 500 F.2d 560, 566, 182 USPQ 298, 301 (CCPA 1974) and *In re Forman*, 463 F.2d 1125, 1129, 175 USPQ 12, 16 (CCPA 1972). Furthermore, in complex systems including a digital computer, a microprocessor, or a complex control unit as one of many block diagram elements, timing between various system elements may be of the essence and without a timing chart relating the timed sequences for each element, an unreasonable amount of work may be required to come up with the detailed relationships an applicant alleges that he or she has solved. See *In re Scarbrough*, 500 F.2d at 566, 182 USPQ at 302. For example, in a block diagram disclosure of a complex claimed system which includes a microprocessor and other system components controlled by the microprocessor, a mere reference to a prior art, commercially available microprocessor, without

any description of the precise operations to be performed by the microprocessor, fails to disclose how such a microprocessor would be properly programmed to either perform any required calculations or to coordinate the other system components in the proper timed sequence to perform the functions disclosed and claimed. If, in such a system, a particular program is disclosed, such a program should be carefully reviewed to ensure that its scope is commensurate with the scope of the functions attributed to such a program in the claims. See *In re Brown*, 477 F.2d at 951, 177 USPQ at 695. Since, the disclosure fails to disclose any program and more than routine experimentation would be required of one skilled in the art to generate such a program, the examiner clearly has a reasonable basis for challenging the sufficiency of such a disclosure.

The claim state "*logic encoded on the computer-processable medium*" doing the multiple claim functions, yet the specification states and as shown by the newly submitted drawings that it is multiple logics encoded on multiple computer-processable mediums (note figure 2, #296, 247, 253, 290, 292, 249, 294, and 251). The specification does not provide an enabling disclosure how a single logic, as claimed, and the single computer-processable medium, as claimed, can accomplished all these functions which the specification states that these functions are done by is multiple logics encoded on multiple computer-processable mediums.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Archibald, et al** in view of **Otsuka, et al**.

Archibald, et al disclose all subject matter, note figures 2, and 7-17, except for the mobile station identifier in a private network. **Otsuka, et al** teaches the use of a mobile station identifier in a private network (column 4, lines 7-38) in a method for providing message service for the purpose of specifically identifying the mobile station in the current and other private networks.

Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to incorporate the use of mobile station identifier in a private network, as taught by **Otsuka, et al**, for the purpose of specifically identifying the mobile station in the current and other private networks in the method for providing message services of **Archibald, et al** in order to provide messages also in private networks.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed February 6, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It must be emphasized that arguments of counsel alone cannot take the place of evidence in the record once an examiner has advanced a reasonable basis for questioning the disclosure. See *In re Budnick*, 537 F.2d at 538, 190 USPQ at 424; *In re Schulze*, 346 F.2d 600, 145 USPQ 716 (CCPA 1965); *In re Cole*, 326 F.2d 769, 140 USPQ 230 (CCPA 1964).

For example, in a case where the record consisted substantially of arguments and opinions of applicants' attorney, the court indicated that factual affidavits could have provided important evidence on the issue of enablement. See *In re Knowlton*, 500 F.2d at 572, 183 USPQ at 37; *In re Wiseman*, 596 F.2d 1019, 201 USPQ 658 (CCPA 1979). If it so easy as applicants' attorney have stated, then it should be very easy for the attorney to provide evidence to back up his argument. Applicants' attorney must show how, by itself as claimed, logic encoded on the computer-processable medium, can receive a user identification for example, or can also transmit the second message to the second mobile station. According to the specification, it is the base station (#208) that receives and transmits. Since applicants' have failed to disclose to the examiner and to the public the encoded logic on the computer-processable medium and only known by the applicants, the examiner cannot determine and is very much hindered by applicants' nondisclosure, if the claims are enabling.

In response to applicants' argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, **Otsuka, et al** teaches the use of a mobile station identifier in a private network (column 4, lines 7-38) in a method for providing message service for the purpose of specifically identifying the mobile station in the current and other private networks. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to incorporate the use of mobile station identifier in a private network, as taught by **Otsuka, et al, for the purpose of specifically identifying the mobile station in the current and other private networks** in the method for providing message services of **Archibald, et al in order to provide messages also in private networks.** The motivation is provided in bold for applicants' attorney, since the attorney seems to clearly missed it in the last Office action. The reason, suggestion, or motivation to combine two or more prior art references in a single invention may come from the references themselves, from knowledge of those skilled in the art that certain references or disclosures in references are known to be of interest in a particular field or from the nature of problem to be solved, *Pro-Mold and Tool Company v. Great Lakes Plastics, Incorporated* 37 USPQ2d 1626 and applicants' attorney approval is not necessary.

During examination before the Patent and Trademark Office, claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation and limitations from the specification may not be imputed to the claims (*Ex parte Akamatsu*, 22 USPQ2d, 1918; *In re Zletz*, 13 USPQ2d 1320, *In re Priest*, 199 USPQ 11). Clear inference to the artisan must be considered, *In re Preda*, 159 USPQ 342.

A prior art reference must be considered together with the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art, In re Samour, 197 USPQ 1. During patent examination, the pending claims must be "*given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.*" Claim term is not limited to single embodiment disclosed in specification, since number of embodiments disclosed does not determine meaning of the claim term, and applicant cannot overcome "*heavy presumption*" that term takes on its ordinary meaning simply by pointing to preferred embodiment (Teleflex Inc. v. Ficosa North America Corp., CA FC, 6/21/02, 63 USPQ2d 1374). Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA1969). All identifications are inherently "unique", if it did not, then it can not identify anything.

Because of the reason stated above and the tremendous and overwhelming evidence that the claimed invention is not patentable, the request for allowance of all pending claims is **DENIED**.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

10. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

11. If applicants wish to request for an interview, an *"Applicant Initiated Interview Request"* form (PTOL-413A) should be submitted to the examiner prior to the interview in order to permit the examiner to prepare in advance for the interview and to focus on the issues to be discussed. This form should identify the participants of the interview, the proposed date of the interview, whether the interview will be personal, telephonic, or video conference, and should include a brief description of the issues to be discussed. A copy of the completed *"Applicant Initiated Interview Request"* form should be attached to the Interview Summary form, PTOL-413 at the completion of the interview and a copy should be given to applicant or applicant's representative.

12. If applicants request an interview after this **final rejection**, prior to the interview, the intended purpose and content of the interview should be presented briefly, in writing.

Such an interview may be granted if the examiner is convinced that disposal or clarification for appeal may be accomplished with only nominal further consideration.

Interviews merely to **restate arguments** of record or to **discuss new limitations** which would require more than nominal reconsideration or new search will be denied.

13. The American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) enacted provisions for the continued examination of a utility or plant application at the request of the applicant (request for continued examination or RCE practice). Since continued prosecution application (CPA) practice is largely redundant in view of RCE practice, the Office is eliminating CPA practice as to utility and plant applications. An applicant for a utility or plant patent may also continue to effectively obtain further examination of the application by filing a continuing application. Since RCE practice does not apply to design applications, CPA practice will remain in place for design applications.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 14, 2003

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eugenia A. Jones, by
telephone at (703) 306-5586, or by mail addressed to: Box Comments —
Patents, Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231, or by facsimile to
(703) 872-9404, marked to the attention of Eugenia A. Jones.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **WILLIAM D CUMMING** whose telephone number is **703-305-4394**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday 6:30am to 12:30pm and Tuesday-Thursday, 1:00pm to 8:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **WILLIAM TROST** can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wdc



UNITED STATES
PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE

William Cumming
Primary Patent Examiner
(703) 305-4394
(703) 746-6075 Fax
william.cumming@uspto.gov


WILLIAM CUMMING
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2600